DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 052 164 24 SP 005 100

TITLE	Procedures Used in Designing a Training Program in Educational Evaluation and Development. Technical Paper No. 1. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Colorado Univ., Boulder. Colorado Center for Training in Educational Evaluation and Development.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO	BR-0-9034
CONTRACT	OEC-0-70-4770(520)
NOTE	27p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Consortia, *Educational Development, *Educational Programs, *Evaluation Methods, *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this technical paper is to outline the procedures used in designing the training programing in educational evaluation and development involving an elaborate collection of data from many sources and a drafting of a tentative plan which was then screened, reviewed, and critiqued by each of the consortium units. The data sources were existing manpower studies, U.S. Office of Education sources, group and individual meetings with consortium units, working papers drafted by several consortium units, questionnaire on educational evaluation and development sent to agencies nationwide and within the Rocky Mountain area, staff meetings at Colorado with frequent checks with other colleagues and consortium units, and a projected conference on educational evaluation and development. [Related documents are SP 005 101-103.] (MBM)

ED052164

Final Report

Technical Paper Number 1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PROCEDURES USED IN DESIGNING A TRAINING PROGRAM IN EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Colorado Center for Training in
Educational Evaluation and Development
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado
80302

The work reported herein was produced under contract with U.S. Office of Education, Contract No. OEC-0-70-4770(520).

SP005100

PROCEDURES USED IN DESIGNING

A TRAINING PROGRAM

IN EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION AND DEVELOPMENT

General Procedures

The purpose of this first technical paper is to outline the procedures that were used in designing the training program in educational evaluation and development. In a second technical paper the description and rationale of the consortium that evolved are presented. Appended to the second technical paper are working papers from several of the consortium units. A third technical paper in this series is concerned with the design which evolved from this planning activity, in effect, the proposed design for training educational evaluators and developers. Technical Paper 4 provides the budgetary information that amplify and in some respects clarify the program proposed in Technical Paper Number 3.

It is of interest to note that in designing an original, novel training program for educational developers and evaluators, the project personnel have followed rather traditional task force procedures, after initial brainstorming sessions. The consortium units, now collectively titled the Colorado Center for Training in Educational Evaluation and Development (CCTEED), proceeded through a series of both group and individual planning meetings, made decisions and counter decisions, and gradually approached their ultimate goal along a path that evidenced

frequent deviation from what would be considered a straight line. Curiously, although the staff of the Laboratory of Educational Research at the University of Colorado (the prime contractor) provided the day to day impetus to encourage focusing on the relevant issues, and attaining meaningful successive approximations, it was inputs from the consortium units and from "users" of educational evaluators and developers that provided the accumulation of data that in large measure shaped the allocation of resources in the final proposal. The responses of consortium units to various requests made of them for ideas and other information were invariably prompt, detailed, and conscientiously stated. As such, these responses became valuable planning inputs.

Sources of Data

To a large extent, the procedures used in designing this training program in educational evaluation and development consisted of an elaborate collection of data from many sources, and a drafting of a tentative plan which was then screened, reviewed and critiqued by each of the consortium units. Their comments and opinions were incorporated in the draft that was then submitted as the Preliminary Final Report. The sources of data consisted of:

1) existing manpower studies;
2) informational inputs from the U.S. Office of Education or its projects,

(a) the original RFP 70-12,

(b) briefings with OE representatives,

(c) The AERA Task Force on Research Training,

(d) the Teaching Research Project to generate information to support planning for training in R, D, D, and E;

3) group and individual meetings with consortium units;

4) working papers drafted by several of the consortium units;

5) questionnaires sent to agencies nationwide and within the Rocky Mountain area;

6) staff meetings at Colorado with frequent checks back to other colleagues and consortium units; and

7) a projected conference on educational evaluation and development.

Each of these sources of data is considered in more detail below:

1. Existing Manpower Studies.

Unfortunately, there is not a single source that has synthesized and incorporated the several manpower and related studies that were completed in the 1960's. (Although the AERA Task Force on Research Training is currently developing such a synthesis, it will not be completed until 1971.) Consequently, it is necessary to study each of the various sources in turn and then attempt to draw some general conclusions therefrom.

In this connection, a series of different efforts were surveyed, namely the work of Bargar (1967), Buswell, et al. (1966), Clark and Hopkins (1969), Clark and Worthen (1967), Fattu (1967), Heiss (1966), National Center for Educational Research and Development (1969), and Sieber (1966).

Generally the picture thus formulated was one portraying a gradually expanding research and development enterprise in the United States. Initially, the need for trained manpower seemed apparent in all the projections, but with the passage of time there seemed to be increasing doubt of the estimates of needed personnel primarily because of the beginning evidences of less support in this area by the federal government, that is, in the late 1960's. One would be led to believe from the various documents that much of the manpower need in R, D, D, and E was met by a type of in-service training, often on an emergency basis, as research related personnel found new skills and new techniques demanded of them in their work. Despite the several training programs that have been initiated in the general area of research and research-related training, it was apparent that in none of the documents consulted was the opinion expressed that the number of new entries to the field who were being trained would be sufficient to meet the manpower needs of the educational research and development enterprise. Further, it was apparent that attention in most studies cited was focused on research training and often research training that might be designated as training for conclusion-oriented

research rather than for decision-oriented research. The studies do not consistently or expansively consider training in educational evaluation, development, and diffusion, although Bargar (1967) approximates this comprehensiveness.

2. U.S. Office of Education Sources.

Initially, it should be mentioned that the request for proposals (RFP 70-12) served as a valuable and powerful stimulus in terms of the thinking of the consortium units. That document made manifest the need in the research and research-related community for: training educational developers, diffusers, and evaluators; for retraining personnel already on the job, filling roles in these areas; and for training personnel below the level of the independent investigator (that is, support personnel). The RFP noted that the reason for the inclusion of a training title in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was to provide staff for the federal centers and laboratories, to assist in the staffing of the supplementary educational centers under Title III of the act, to undertake the evaluation required of programs supported under Titles I and III of ESEA, as well as to provide personnel to work in other settings related to research. In a very real sense, it was suggested in the RFP that under Title IV of ESEA, too much emphasis had been placed on the training of conclusion-oriented researchers, as distinguished from decision-oriented researchers. In no way was it suggested that there was not

a need for conclusion-oriented educational researchers. The need for such individuals was and is apparent, and it remains great. What the RFP was stating, however, was that there was a requirement for new programs designed to train decision-oriented inquirers, and that this need certainly would not be met unless there was a major reallocation of resources and a fundamental rethinking of the processes by which educational evaluators and developers are trained. The RFP gave the persons working on this proposal an initial set to incorporate into the planning, and in the actual training, inputs received from what might be termed "user organizations" (for example, public schools, state departments of education, laboratories and centers, etc.).

The intent of the RFP and the evolving thinking of the U.S. Office of Education was conveyed in an additional source of data, namely briefings with personnel at the U.S. Office. Consequently, in late June a meeting was held at Washington for project directors. Individual conferences were held in early September in Washington with project directors, and other information was forthcoming via the R, D, D, and E manpower study being conducted at Teaching Research, as indicated below. In these briefings, it became apparent that there was a wide variation in the thinking of project design personnel as to the suitability and/or feasibility of training personnel in certain of these functional areas. More agreement existed on how to train evaluators than on how to train developers. There were even greater disparities on how to train diffusion personnel. As will become apparent in

Technical Paper Number 3 in this series, the Colorado Center for Training Educational Evaluators and Developers plans to emphasize evaluation more than development, and excludes diffusion almost entirely. On this issue, and others, it was possible to interact extensively with personnel in the U.S. Office of Education during the design grant period of six months, a situation often not possible when proposals are being submitted for possible funding.

Of substantial assistance to us as a source of data was the extensive series of technical papers that were forthcoming from the AERA task force project on training research personnel. The definitions of research, development, diffusion, and evaluation were helpful as well as the various skills listed for personnel holding jobs in these various functional areas. For example, the questionnaire discussed in section five below includes a list of skills of developers and evaluators that had been developed by the AERA task force. In addition, much data from the technical papers series seemed to suggest that there was a need, largely unmet, for educational evaluators and developers. Four sources of data provided the base for this conclusion. The first three were comparisons of the vacancies existing at the AERA placement service in 1968, 1969, and 1970, as compared with the number of applicants for positions, while the fourth was a survey of 58 employers of research and research-related personnel (see Technical Papers 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10). From these papers, it was clear that there was a great need for personnel

in educational evaluation and development; however, it also appeared that there was a trend in 1970 toward less willingness to hire new personnel in these areas and rather more stress on retraining personnel already employed by organizations having responsibility in these areas.

A second project which, like the AERA Task Force on Research Training, is also being supported with U.S. Office of Education funds, is the project housed at Teaching Research, a division of the Oregon State System of Higher Education. This project has as its main responsibility the generation of information that will support long-term manpower studies, and support planning for training programs in educational R, D, D, and E. This project has been directly helpful in two regards in the formation of this proposal. First, via a cross-referencing conference in October, 1970, it was possible to interact with other designers of training programs, as well as with professors and others who had spent considerable time collecting, explaining, and writing about R, D, D, and E. The second major assistance from this project came by way of the conceptual papers that were developed for that project (the papers were presented by Briggs, Gideonese, Glass and Worthen, and Schalock and Sell).

It should be noted that inputs from the last two sources of data mentioned, that is, the AERA task force project and the Teaching Research project, were readily incorporated into the thinking of the consortium in Colorado. This

was possible because one of the consortium planners is directing the AERA task force project, while two of the Colorado planners wrote one of the conceptual papers for the Teaching Research project. In addition, three of the developers of this proposal were invited, in varying capacities, to attend the cross-referencing conference held in Seattle and did so.

3. Meetings with Consortium Units.

Several varied activities were carried out with consortium units, including both large group meetings, at which nearly all consortium units were present, and individual meetings, with each of the consortium units. The units that have been and are involved in the consortium are listed below:

1) The University of Colorado, Boulder, Denver, and Colorado Springs;
2) The Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation (CIRCE), University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois;
3) The Biological Sciences Curriculum Study (BSCS), Boulder, Colorado;
4) The Earth Sciences Educational Program (ESEP). Boulder, Colorado;
5) The High School Geography Project, Boulder, Colorado (terminated August 31, 1970);
6) The Social Sciences Education Consortium (SSEC), Boulder, Colorado;

7) The Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory (SWCEL), Albuquerque, New Mexico;

8) The Southwest Regional Laboratory for Educational Research and Development (SWRL), Inglewood, California;

9) The John F. Kennedy Child Development Center, University of Colorado Medical Center, Denver, Colorado;

10) The Denver Public Schools, Denver, Colorado;

11) The Interstate Educational Resources Service Center, Salt Lake City, Utah;

12) The Northern Colorado Educational Board of Cooperative Services, Boulder, Colorado;

13) The Colorado State Department of Education, Denver, Colorado;

14) The Ford Foundation, New York, New York (and a Field Office for the Leadership Development Program, Denver, Colorado);and

15) The Office of Education Regional Office, Denver, Colorado.

The meetings with these units provided valuable data for planning purposes. It was recommended to the units that they emphasize strongly those things which they felt were in their organization's best interest, hoping that by this procedure bonds between the consortium units might be more direct and lasting. To this end, the source of data mentioned below was undertaken.

4. Working Papers of Consortium Units.

Consortium units were asked to develop independent working papers early in the course of the project. Those units that were unable to do so (primarily because of time constraints) were contacted individually, so that their specific reactions to the issues considered in the working papers could be incorporated into the project planning. The outline that was used as a guide for the development of the working papers is included as Appendix A of this technical paper. The working papers actually produced have been included as appendices in Technical Paper Number 2. The reader is referred to that source for further elaboration of the issues that they address. Suffice it to say that it was from the content of these working papers that the design project personnel began to move toward "intensive training institutes" described in Technical Paper Number 3. Additionally, it was felt that the working papers further confirmed the belief that many organizations were finding it difficult to add personnel, because of financial constraints, and were more concerned with the retraining of existing personnel in new skill areas.

5. Questionnaire on Educational Evaluation and Development.

After considerable feedback had been received, the general types of training and levels of training that would be offered in this training program began to

emerge. However, it was felt necessary to survey a wider base of organizations in order to determine more accurately the specific demands for different types of training programs by personnel already employed in educational development and evaluation. To this end, a questionnaire was designed and mailed to a sample of about 300 different organizations. The questionnaire and the cover letter that accompanied it are included as Appendix B in this technical paper. The interested reader is referred to that appendix to determine the exact questions that were asked. It should be indicated that the data forthcoming from the questionnaire are reported in Technical Paper Number 3 in this series.

The sample used was deliberately selective in certain respects in that the sample was selected within predetermined categories. Questionnaires were sent to all R & D centers, all regional laboratories, all ERIC organizations, all consortium units, the 30 largest school districts in the United States, and to selected research projects, agencies, and organizations who were thought to have personnel needs in evaluation and development. Additionally, via two consortium units, school districts of a smaller size were sampled; i.e., all seven school districts in the Northern Colorado Educational Board of Cooperative Services Organization were included as were a random one-third of the moderate size school districts in the eight states served by the

Interstate Educational Resources Service Center in Salt Lake City (Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming). A moderate size school district was interpreted as one having between 2500 and 10,000 students. Districts under this size were not sampled because it was felt unlikely that they have personnel currently engaged in evaluation or development to any large extent.

6. Staff Meetings.

Frequent meetings were held by the four staff members at the University of Colorado who were principally charged with the responsibility to develop and design the training program. These meetings were called on an *ad hoc* basis, and were held at least once weekly. In intervening periods perceptions, plans, and contemplated procedures were checked with colleagues both at the university and nationally, as well as with consortium units. The luxury of having six months to plan such a training program was unusual, but beneficial for a number of reasons. One primary reason is indicated in the closing paragraph of this technical paper; that is, it is essential that the planning period be long enough to allow data from many sources to have an impact upon and influence the resultant design.

persons filling new slots resulting from reallocation

7. <u>The Evaluation and Development Blow Your Mind Conference.</u>

This conference was held on December 9-10, 1970. Three consultants provided most of the input: Dr. Arthur Lumsdaine, Professor of Psychology, University of Washington; Dr. Sam Messick, Educational Testing Service; and Dr. Sam Sieber, Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University. The team of consultants assembled for two primary purposes. First, they investigated and critically evaluated the capacity of the existing structure at Colorado to administratively and instructionally support an evaluation and development training program. Second, they were encouraged to free associate and otherwise brainstorm on the essential elements and other ramifications involved in training educational evaluators and developers. An abbreviated summary on the conference will be appended to this final report as Appendix C. Since the final report will be mailed about the time that the conference concludes, Appendix C will not be included but will be forwarded as soon as available.

The title of the conference, although somewhat prostituted by use of current vernacular, resulted from the intention to encourage and in every way facilitate the creation of "way-out" training ideas and concepts. It is felt that many such ideas, after appropriate mellowing during an intervening time period, conceivably could become feasible and valuable contributions to the training program.

It is interesting to note the evolution that has occurred, over the period that the program has been designed and planned in the thinking of both the personnel involved at the University of Colorado and of those associated with the consortium units. When the original proposal was drafted in May, 1970, it served, in effect, as a type of baseline for our thinking at that point in time. Subsequently, the August 1 progress report, and then the outline and oral report to the U.S. Office of Education in early September, 1970, served as marking places denoting shifts in orientation, in assumptions, in feasibility, and in concepts of the program being designed. Likewise, the Preliminary Final Report served as a type of current perspective on the same issues. It is likewise interesting to note the pronounced differences that exist between the plan now conceptualized (presented primarily in Technical Paper Number 3) as compared to the type of training program that probably would have emerged had that been the initial charge in May, 1970. The resultant changes, primarily in the direction of increased effectiveness and enhanced feasibility, almost certainly would not have evolved without the six month design grant.

REFERENCES

Bargar, R. R., & Okorodudu, C. Review of research related to training for research in education. Cooperative Research Project No. 3191, USOE, 1967.

Briggs, L. J. "Development and diffusion as mechanisms for bringing about educational improvement." Working draft #1. Paper prepared for a conference conducted by Teacher-Research Division of the Oregon Dept. of Higher Education, September, 1970.

Buswell, G. T., McConnell, T. R., Heiss, A. M., & Knoell, D. M. Training for educational research. Berkeley: University of California Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1966 (Final Report of USOE CRP No. 51074).

Clark, D. L., & Hopkins, J. E. A report on educational research, development, and diffusion manpower, 1964-1974. Bloomington, Indiana: School of Education, Indiana University, 1969 (Final Report of USOE CRP X-022).

Clark, D. L., & Worthen, B. R. (Eds). Preparing research personnel for education. PDK-AERA, 1967.

Fattu, N. A. A survey of educational research and an appraisal by scientists from other fields. Final Report, Project No. 525, Contract No. SAE 8134, USOE, 1967.

Gideonse, H. D. "Research and development for education: A market model." Working draft #2. Paper prepared for a conference conducted by Teacher-Research Division of the Oregon Dept. of Higher Education, September, 1970.

Glass, G. V, & Worthen, B. R. "Educational inquiry and the practice of education." Paper prepared for conference conducted by Teacher-Research Division of the Oregon Dept. of Higher Education, July, 1970.

Glass, G. V, & Worthen, B. R. "Essential knowledge and competencies for research, development, diffusion and evaluation." Technical Paper Number 5. AERA Task Force.

Glass, G. V, & Worthen, B. R. "Interrelationships among research and research-related roles in education: A conceptual framework." Technical Paper Number 4. AERA Task Force.

Goodwin, W. L., & Worthen, B. R. "An interpretation of the data from the AERA Employment Services, 1968-70 and the 1969-70 telephone interviews: Implications for supply and demand and emphasis in research and research-related roles." Technical Paper Number 10. AERA Task Force.

Heiss, A. M. A study of outstanding scholars and their training for research. In Buswell, G. T., et al., Training for educational research. Berkeley: University of California Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1966. (Final Report of USOE CRP No. 51074).

National Center for Educational Research and Development, USOE. Educational research and development in the United States. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

Oldefendt, Sue J., & Worthen, B. R. "An analysis of 1969 AERA Employment Service Data: Competencies possessed by applicants and areas of specialization required for positions listed." Technical Paper Number 7. AERA Task Force.

Rogers, W. T., Worthen, B. R., & Sanders, J. R. "An analysis of 1970 AERA Employment Service Data: Competencies reported by applicants and competencies required for positions listed." Technical Paper Number 8. AERA Task Force.

Sanders J. R., & Worthen, B. R. "An analysis of employers' perceptions of the relative importance of selected research and research-related competencies and shortages of personnel with such competencies." Technical Paper Number 3. AERA Task Force.

Schalock, H. D., & Sell, G. R. "The analysis of educational research, development, diffusion and evaluation: A conceptual framework." Paper prepared for a conference conducted by Teacher-Research Division of the Oregon Dept. of Higher Education, September, 1970.

Sieber, S. D. The organization of educational research. New York: Columbia University Bureau of Applied Social Research, 1966. (Final Report of USOE CRP No. 1974).

Worthen, B. R., & Sanders, J. R. "An analysis of 1968 AERA Employment Service Data: Competencies possessed by applicants and competencies required for positions listed." Technical Paper Number 6. AERA Task Force.

TECHNICAL PAPER NUMBER 1

APPENDIX A

Evaluation, Development and Diffusion

Training Design Project

Laboratory of Educational Research
University of Colorado

28 August 1970

Suggested Format for Working Papers

of Consortium Constituent Agencies

I. In your organization, what personnel needs exist for persons trained in evaluation, development, and diffusion?
   A. How many personnel, and at what level (Bachelors, Masters, Ph.D.), are presently employed in evaluation? in development? in diffusion?
   B. How many additional personnel, and at what level, are needed in evaluation? in development? in diffusion?
   C. If your organization's annual budget were increased by $100,000, how many additional persons, and at what level, would be hired in evaluation? in development? in diffusion?
   D. What specific skills (e.g., in design, research methodology, statistical analysis, objectives analysis, measurement, instrumentation, change strategies, research, etc.) would be needed by such personnel working for your organization?

II. Given the personnel presently employed by your organization in evaluation, development, and diffusion, what needs have they for additional training?
   A. Further training is needed in what specific skills (e.g., in design, research methodology, statistical analysis, objectives analysis, measurement, survey research, instrumentation, change strategies, etc.)?
   B. What periods of time (e.g., two weeks, six weeks, one semester, one year, etc.) for such training would be preferable? What periods of training would be feasible?
   C. Would persons so trained probably return to your organization in their former position, in a redefined position, or in a new position?
   D. How much financial support do you feel would be necessary to interest the person in the preferred training periods described above?
   E. Would your organization give employees a year's leave of absence for training? Would it grant a leave of absence for shorter time periods (please be specific on duration on leave of absence that would be authorized)?

F. Would your organization provide the monies necessary to supplement a trainee's stipend (the current weekly stipend is $75 plus $15 per dependent; the current annual stipend is $2,400, plus $500 per dependent)?

G. Can you think of persons currently in your organization who would avail themselves of such training? How many in evaluation? in development? in diffusion?

H. Would the possibility of earning a Master's degree as a result of such training serve as a strong incentive for persons in your organization?

III. What specific training program components (courses, internship experiences, etc.) do you feel would be best to bring about the skills described in item I.D above (primarily in a training program for bringing new personnel into the field)?

IV. What specific training program components (courses, internship experiences, etc.) do you feel would be most important to bring about the skills described in item II.A above (primarily in a training program for persons already employed by your organization)?

V. How do you envision that your organization might be best used, both as an instructional site and as an internship site for training evaluators? developers? diffusion agents? Are there individuals presently employed by your organization who (a) could supervise an internship in your agency in evaluation, development, or diffusion, and (b) would be willing to do so?

TECHNICAL PAPER NUMBER 1

APPENDIX B

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

BOULDER, COLORADO 80302

LABORATORY OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

As you may know, under Title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the USOE has funded twelve agencies to develop new training models and programs for personnel in educational research, development, diffusion, and evaluation. A consortium in and around Colorado received one of the grants, and has subsequently focused its design efforts on development and evaluation.

Enclosed is a questionnaire (one side dealing with evaluation, the other with development) and a pre-addressed envelope. Given your leadership role in your organization, your responses would be extremely helpful to us in our planning. In some cases, you may want particular employees or associates working with you to answer certain of the questions because of their involvement with evaluation and development. I realize that you are bombarded with similar requests, yet, as always, it is hoped that you can respond at once, possibly even returning the completed questionnaire in today's mail. An effort has been made to minimize the time required to complete the instrument; fifteen to twenty minutes appears to be about average.

Thank you in advance for providing this professional response. Your input, and the inputs of other organization heads, will be instrumental in designing certain features of the training program.

Sincerely,

William L. Goodwin

William L. Goodwin
Design Project Director

WLG/hm

enclosures

3. Assuming a 20% increase in your annual budget, how many evaluators would your organization hire next year, and at what level?

____at the BS level; ____at the MS level; ____at the PhD level.

4. Assuming no increase in your present annual budget, how many evaluators would your organization hire next year, and at what level, either as replacements or as persons filling new slots resulting from reallocation of resources?

____at the BS level; ____at the MS level; ____at the PhD level.

5. If high quality, short-term training institutes were held in evaluation, how many staff in your organization would be permitted to take how much training? (Assume that your staff continue to receive their regular salary from your organization, while a training stipend from external sources defrays their costs of living away from home.)

Please fill in all three blanks.

Either ___ could attend one 2-week institute annually;
or ___ could attend two 2-week institutes annually;
or ___ could attend three 2-week institutes annually.

6. Assuming that you were hiring a new evaluator, rank order below the importance of his having each of the following skills, from the perspective of your organization. (Rank all the skills; rank the most important skill as 1, etc.)

7. If the short-term training institute was held in evaluation, rank order below the importance of training in each of the following evaluation skills, from the perspective of your organization. (Rank all the skills rank the most important skill as 1, etc.)

#6	#7	
___	___	Identifying goals of the program to be evaluated, and the goals' social relevance and implicit values.
___	___	Helping system personnel develop objectives to satisfy needs or solve problems, and establishing priorities among these objective
___	___	Translating broad objectives into specific observable objectives.
___	___	Identifying standards or norms decision-makers will use in interpreting data.
___	___	Establishing an appropriate evaluation design for the program involved.
___	___	Monitoring the program to detect deviations from the design or specified procedures.
___	___	Selecting or developing and using valid measurement techniques to yield information on outcomes.
___	___	Employing appropriate techniques of data analysis.
___	___	Making recommendations as the result of evaluation.
___	___	Writing the evaluation report, or otherwise reporting the result
___	___	Other (Specify) _____
___	___	Other (Specify) _____

Name_____Position_____Organization_____

1. What is the present composition of your organization's professional staf

____at the BS level; ____at the MS level; ____at the PhD level.

2. How much of your professional staff's time is spent primarily on activit that involve evaluation? (Express in full-time equivalents; e.g., if three staff each spend half-time in evaluation, the full-time equivalent is 1.5 FTE.)

___FTE at the BS level; ___FTE at the MS level; ___FTE at the PhD leve

3. Assuming a 20% increase in your annual budget, how many evaluators would your organization hire next year, and at what level?

____at the BS level; ____at the MS level; ____at the PhD level.

4. Assuming no increase in your present annual budget, how many evaluators would your organization hire next year, and at what level, either as replacements or as persons filling new slots resulting from reallocation of resources?

____at the BS level; ____at the MS level; ____at the PhD level.

5. If high quality, short-term training institutes were held in evaluation, how many staff in your organization would be permitted to take how much training? (Assume that your staff continue to receive their regular salary from your organization, while a training stipend from external sources defrays their costs of living away from home.)

Please fill in all three blanks.

Either ___ could attend one 2-week institute annually;
or ___ could attend two 2-week institutes annually;
or ___ could attend three 2-week institutes annually.

6. Assuming that you were hiring a new evaluator, rank order below the impo tance of his having each of the following skills, from the perspective of your organization. (Rank all the skills; rank the most important skill as 1, etc.)

7. If the short-term training institute was held in evaluation, rank order below the importance of training in each of the following evaluation skills, from the perspective of your organization. (Rank all the skills rank the most important skill as 1, etc.)

#6	#7	
____	____	Identifying goals of the program to be evaluated, and the goals' social relevance and implicit values.
____	____	Helping system personnel develop objectives to satisfy needs or solve problems, and establishing priorities among these objective
____	____	Translating broad objectives into specific observable objectives.
____	____	Identifying standards or norms decision-makers will use in inter preting data.
____	____	Establishing an appropriate evaluation design for the program involved.
		Monitoring the program to detect [illegible]

of resources?

____at the BS level; ____at the MS level; ____at the PhD level.

1. If high quality, short-term training institutes were held in development, how many staff in your organization would be permitted to take how much training? (Assume that your staff continue to receive their regular salary from your organization, while a training stipend from external sources defrays their costs of living away from home.)

Please fill in all three blanks.

Either ___ could attend one 2-week institute annually;
or ___ could attend two 2-week institutes annually;
or ___ could attend three 2-week institutes annually.

2. Assuming that you were hiring a new developer, rank order below the importance of his having each of the following skills, from the perspecti of your organization. (Rank all the skills; rank the most important skil as 1, etc.)

3. If the short-term training institute was held in development, rank order below the importance of training in each of the following development skills, from the perspective of your organization. (Rank all the skills; rank the most important skill as 1, etc.)

12 #13

___ ____ Interpreting, evaluating, and synthesizing relevant literature, and drawing on research results in planning developmental activities.

___ ____ Developing instructional systems, their elements, and interrelations among these elements.

___ ____ Specifying desired performance objectives, and establishing standards for judging attainment of objectives.

___ ____ Choosing appropriate instructional and media techniques in developing educational products and/or processes.

___ ____ Determining appropriate sequences of topics in instruction.

___ ____ Developing products based on effective oral and written forms of instructional communications.

___ ____ Directing the work of production personnel.

___ ____ Selecting or developing and using appropriate techniques for measuring outcomes.

___ ____ Designing and managing laboratory tests of developed techniques and materials, and also field tryouts and tests.

___ ____ Reporting evaluation of outcomes and specifying requirements for revision based upon outcome evaluation.

___ ____ Other (Specify) _____

___ ____ Other (Specify) _____

3. How much of your professional staff's time is spent primarily on activit that involve development? (As in #2, express in full-time-equivalents.)

____FTE at the BS level; ____FTE at the MS level; ____FTE at the PhD lev

). Assuming a 20% increase in your annual budget, how many developers would your organization hire next year, and at what level?

____at the BS level; ____at the MS level; ____at the PhD level.

). Assuming no increase in your present annual budget, how many developers would your organization hire next year, and at what level, either as replacements or as persons filling new slots resulting from reallocation of resources?

____at the BS level; ____at the MS level; ____at the PhD level.

1. If high quality, short-term training institutes were held in development, how many staff in your organization would be permitted to take how much training? (Assume that your staff continue to receive their regular salary from your organization, while a training stipend from external sources defrays their costs of living away from home.)

Please fill in all three blanks.

Either ___ could attend one 2-week institute annually;
or ___ could attend two 2-week institutes annually;
or ___ could attend three 2-week institutes annually.

2. Assuming that you were hiring a new developer, rank order below the importance of his having each of the following skills, from the perspecti of your organization. (Rank all the skills; rank the most important skil as 1, etc.)

3. If the short-term training institute was held in development, rank order below the importance of training in each of the following development skills, from the perspective of your organization. (Rank all the skills; rank the most important skill as 1, etc.)

12 #13

___ | ____ Interpreting, evaluating, and synthesizing relevant literature, and drawing on research results in planning developmental activities.

___ | ____ Developing instructional systems, their elements, and interrelations among these elements.

___ | ____ Specifying desired performance objectives, and establishing standards for judging attainment of objectives.

___ | ____ Choosing appropriate instructional and media techniques in developing educational products and/or processes.

___ | ____ Determining appropriate sequences of topics in instruction.

___ | ____ Developing products based on effective oral and written forms of instructional communications.

___ | ____ Directing the work of production personnel.

___ | ____ Selecting or developing and using appropriate techniques for measuring outcomes.